



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,653	06/27/2001	Daniel Dedu-Constantin	MS146953.01/MSFTP250US	6973
27195	7590	09/11/2008		
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP			EXAMINER	
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER			CHEN, TE Y	
1900 EAST NINTH STREET				
CLEVELAND, OH 44114			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/11/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com  
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com  
lpasterchk@thepatentattorneys.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/894,653	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DEDU-CONSTANTIN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> SUSAN Y. CHEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2161

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SUSAN Y. CHEN. (3) Daniel Crouse.

(2) Evan Perry. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 04 September 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Pub No. 2002/0019824 A1.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant representative proposed amended claims and argued that the prior art of Holder et al. failed to disclose the claimed relational database, the examiner disagreed and directed the representative attention to Fig. 2 and the sections: 0021-0022 of Holders' invention, which in contrary to the representative arguments clearly disclosed the claimed relational database, thus, based on the discussion the agreement was not available.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.